

REMARKS

The present application was filed on July 31, 2003 with claims 1-30. Claims 1-30 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1 and 28-30 are the independent claims.

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by reference that is not clearly specified.

In this response, Applicants traverse the §102(e) rejection.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the remarks below.

In the Office Action at page 2, second to last paragraph, the Examiner states that claims 1-30 are rejected over a reference identified as U.S. Patent No. 7,231,517. The Examiner further states that this cited patent is issued to “Cameron Ginter.” However, the cited patent is in fact issued to “Cameron Mashayekhi” and not to “Cameron Ginter.” All of the arguments presented by the Examiner at pages 2-10 refer to a Ginter reference, and not to the identified Mashayekhi reference, and further refer to paragraph numbers that are apparently not present in the cited U.S. Patent No. 7,231,517. Also, the Form PTO-892 provided with the Office Action cites to five different Ginter references, so Applicants are unable to determine the particular reference that the Examiner is relying on in the §102(e) rejection.

It appears that the Examiner has made a fundamental error in failing to clearly identify the particular reference that is relied upon.

Accordingly, Applicants submit the §102(e) rejection is deficient on its face and should be withdrawn.

Any new Office Action should clearly indicate the reference(s) relied upon in formulating a rejection of the claims, and must be indicated as having a non-final status so that Applicants can be given a reasonable opportunity to respond to an appropriate rejection.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: March 3, 2008

Joseph B. Ryan
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 37,922
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560
(516) 759-7517